DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 710 TM 820 857

AUTHOR Hall, Charles W. L.
TITLE Needs Assessment: A Critical Component in Professional Development Planning and Programming.
PUB DATE Feb 82
NOTE 41p.; Figure 1 contains small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Planning; *Evaluation Methods; *Needs Assessment; Objectives; Program Design; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Program Improvement; *Surveys

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this investigation (special field project) was to seek out theoretical and research-proven foundations pertaining to needs assessment activities and their potential impact upon the development and implementation of a Division of Student Affairs Professional Development Program. It was discovered that the activity is highly fragmented and lacking, both in published professional literature and traditional research to substantiate its utility. Fragmentation has generated a variety of needs assessment models, management strategies, and procedural techniques with highly specialized instrumentation. The needs assessment process includes: (1) idea conception (the needs assessment model), (2) procedural tasks (the management strategy) (3) ways and means of acquiring data (the specific or combined techniques), (4) data collection of needs (the specific instrument), and (5) implementation of the idea (decision, analysis, and dissemination). The key to a valid needs assessment lies within selecting and integrating those components which work harmoniously together to capture critical needs. The success of any well-orchestrated needs assessment depends upon the effectiveness and efficiency of the implemented professional development program to satisfy those individually identified needs and wants of the targeted population. The appendix contains the developed needs assessment instrument. (Author/PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223710

Needs Assessment

A Critical Component

in Professional Development Planning and Programming

Charles W. L. Hall, M.Ed.

University of Southern Mississippi

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. W. L. Hall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 820857

Running head: Needs Assessment

February 1982

Abstract

The purpose of this investigation (special field project) was to seek out theoretical and research proven foundations pertaining to Needs Assessment activities and their potential impact upon the development and implementation of a Division of Student Affairs Professional Development Program. It was discovered that the activity is highly fragmented and lacking, both in published professional literature and traditional research to substantiate its utility. Fragmentation has generated a variety of needs assessment models, management strategies, procedural techniques with highly specialized instrumentation. The key to a valid needs assessment lies within selecting and integrating those components which work harmoniously together to capture critical needs. The success of any well orchestrated Needs Assessment will depend upon the effectiveness and efficiency of the implemented professional development program to satisfy those individually identified needs and wants of the targeted population.

Needs Assessment

A Critical Component

in Professional Development Planning and Programming

Professional development planning and programming cannot, with success, be developed in an intellectual void or on the realm of science fictional fantasy if it is to address specific human needs and wants. Since in all reality, a program of professional development (by its very nature) is an experiment in a community of sharing - as it was best put long ago by a Great Master, "to each according to his own need." It is with this fundamental belief, the very essence of participation and unity of purpose, that such a program might be implemented and actualized.

One problem often encountered by would-be program designers - is their sometime inability to focus on the appropriate target population (e.g. that group of individuals to receive greatest benefit from the proposed program, in terms of practicality and specific usefulness or applicability to their daily working lives).

A second problem most often to be confronted is the all pressing need to develop a standing list of professional development "objectives" and "goals" which invariably tend to be very ambiguous at best (e.g. participants find it impossible to relate in practical and useful ways, to their own personal situation - thereby weakening resolve and support for the entire program). These ambiguous objectives and goals further compound group dynamics and confuses the basic issues of translating these objectives into definitions of needs and the goals into realized satisfaction (e.g. need satisfiers).

At this point, it might do well to establish a criteria for the success of a developmental program:

1. It brings together a restricted group for a specific purpose;
2. The group's activities are directed through consensus;
3. The group achieves through the meeting of individual needs (necessary) and wants (desired);
4. As individual satisfaction increases, overall participation, communication and unity of purpose is continually reinforced (e.g. a critiera for a successful program has been established).

All of the aforesaid discussion (e.g. reality, focus, objective, goals and success) relates directly to the purposes and scope of this investigation into "needs assessment" - a strategy utilizing various techniques to arrive at the acquisition of the needs and wants of the individual, while further meshing these through a priority scheme to achieve group consensus, to the final attainment of universal program goals.

In order that we may acquire some level of understanding relative to the act of needs assessment and the sciences of actualizing technical interventions, it would be well worth our time to review the state of these activities.

State of the Act of Assessment

In order for us to appreciate the difficulties involved with the undertaking of a needs assessment project, one should be familiar with its recent appearance upon the educational scene. In many quarters it is considered a stepchild of educational research methodology.

There seems to be a fair amount of literature dealing both directly and indirectly with the subject matter of Needs Assessment, spanning some twenty years, covering a variety of users. It was noted that the literature is scarce in conjunction with profession development (or Continuing Education) and nearly non-existent on the use of needs assessment strategies involving student personnel work.

The area of Needs Assessment is rather eclectic (according to the literature) in that it encompasses many definitions, strategies, techniques, processes and models (Moore, 1980). Though most authorities on Needs Assessment have accepted that the term "Needs Assessment" refers to any systematic process for collecting and analyzing information about the educational needs of individuals or organizations (Moore, 1980).

It was rather interesting also to note the magnitude of these studies referred to in the literature - that is, according to most authors the majority of Needs Assessment projects undertaken are on a small scale, informal and inexpensive - and hardly ever find their way into print. Whereas, those that are generally published are just the opposite, large, complex and extremely costly (Moore, 1980).

Moore's (1980) study dealt with the development of a Needs Assessment model which he was quick to point out the fact that a number of writers feel that much research still remains to be done on the entire question of Needs Assessment (e.g. management, design and implementation of findings). Moore noted thses specific areas of concern:

1. Effectiveness of needs assessment techniques and strategies;
2. Validity and reliability of various types of instruments and

questioning techniques;

3. Cost/benefit ratios for various techniques.

Another area considered worthy of additional research, deals with the need to examine the use and impact of the findings they generate, an intere ting side to this was a chapter entitled "Evaluating the Assessment: Did Anything Happen After We Left?" (Moore, 1980). Some administrators would profit from such a question.

Moore (1980) did highlight the fact that the needs assessment issue is two sided. On one hand if we deal to much with "system level" discrepancies (i.e. the needs of the aggregate), in that participant needs could be last in the composite - whereas same participants might be unable to relate identified needs to their own circumstances. On the other hand, this might be overcome by increasing the ability of the participant to assess their own needs on a continuing basis (i.e., using a dialogue approach). The same arguments could also be used to draw a dichotomy between the techniques of survey questionnaire versus the interview.

Conceptual Model

Before I get into techniques, permit me to regress back to his (Moore, 1980) comments on a Needs Assessment Model. For his purposes, he defines Needs Assessment in terms of decision making, and pointed it up as a essential component of the program development process. He noted several models, one by Griffiths (1959) emphasizing the "decision making process," and another by Havelock (1969) emphasizing the need-reduction process." Moore's model could be considered a "consensus

model" of what is, in so doing he identified eight steps in his particular Needs Assessment strategy (model) as follows:

1. Identification of a problem.
2. Development of a plan (i.e. purposes and resources).
3. Establishment of an implementation mechanism (i.e. management of coordination).
4. Definitions of data requirements (i.e. characteristics, needs, resources).
5. Identification of data sources (i.e. people, records and other studies).
6. Collection of data (i.e. identifying or inferring needs).
7. Analysis of data (i.e. judging, camparng , and ranking).
8. Reporting (e.g. data for decison making activities).

Moore (1980) concluded that rarely are comprehensive needs assessments ever undertaken, do to realities of time, staff and funds. Also, too many times the techniques are over emphasized at the expense of the needs assessment process.

In relating back to Moore's model again, specifically the component dealing with identification of data sources, Gunzberger (1980) pointed out the need to identify similar programs at the local, regional and national levels to serve as inputs of experience and perhaps generalizable results, needed or at least considered when designing initial instrumentation.

Barbulesco (1980) also pointed out four additional considerations in respect to the analysis of data component: that the data should be classified into need areas; that the nature and extent of needs be established; that a consideration of feasibility be considered to meet

particular needs; and that an account of varying perspectives be used as a validation of needs.

Management Plan/Strategy

Most authorities agree that once the general model or strategy has been chosen the next step would be to develop a specific operational or management plan for conducting the needs assessment project activities. Veres (1980) and specifically Barbulesco (1980) hammer home the unescapable need for a "plan."

Barbulesco's (1980) research caused her to conclude the sufficiency of the following recommended sixteen step operational plan:

1. Deciding to conduct a Needs Assessment.
2. Arranging for coordination of the Needs Assessment.
3. Specifying the purpose of the Needs Assessment.
4. Defining the scope of the Needs Assessment.
5. Assessing obstacles and restraints.
6. Informing and involving the community.
7. Identifying symptoms of broad need areas.
8. Identifying and selecting appropriate needs assessment techniques.
9. Setting criteria for measuring needs.
10. Getting needs data.
11. Summarizing the needs data.
12. Interpreting the data and identifying the needs.
13. Ranking identified needs.
14. Evaluating the study.
15. Reporting to the decision makers.
16. Implementing the findings.

Barbulesco (1980) also goes into considerable detail in establishing criteria for selecting an effective Needs Assessment model, prior to developing the plan. She also felt most Needs Assessment studies highlighted in the literature were strong on data sources and collection techniques, but weak on analyses and actual assessment of educational needs.

In contrast to the above plan, Rimmer and Burt (1980) offered a much more streamlined and simplified version in seven steps:

1. Form a planning committee.
2. Define program goals.
3. Develop instruments.
4. Conduct a pilot study.
5. Administer the questionnaires.
6. Implement the results.
7. Conduct a follow-up Needs Assessment.

Every management plan finds its fulfillment in the specific techniques selected and employed. The value and validity of that plan shall as well relate directly to the instrumentation developed as we shall see.

Techniques

At this point in the process a model has been identified, a process adopted and implemented in the form of an operational (management) plan. The spotlight now falls upon a vehicle to be chosen to carry the burden of the assessment. The vehicle shall be a specific technique or a combination of techniques - each having its own particular instrumentation to facilitate the data-gathering effort.

Barbulesco (1980), Gunzberger (1980), Hentges and Hosokawa (1980), Moore (1980), Rimmer and Burt (1980), Veres (1980) and others have

identified a number of techniques and their related instrumentation components as follows:

	Techniques		Instrumentation
1.	Interviewing	-	Agenda or rating scheme
2.	Surveying	-	Checklist or short answer questions
3.	Delpi	-	Narrative questions
4.	Testing	-	Test book and answer sheet
5.	Cybernetics	-	General questions and listing
6.	Resolutions	-	Agenda and listing

In investigating these techniques and their related instrumentation in more depth, I discovered three categories of report: self, combined self and group, and group (the category to be selected depends on the nature of the assessment).

Self-Report Techniques

1. Interviewing

Bock (1980) and Veres (1980) both used the interviewing technique to geographic advantage - with widely scattered populations. The interviewing assessment technique is an instrument consisting of an agenda and/or a rating schme, utilized by an interviewer. The technique can be used (and most often is) "face to face" (a direct method) or "over-the-phone" (an indirect method). The major strength lies in the use of trained interviewers to pick up non-verbal ques and the acquisition of correctly interpreted data. A major weakness is the intervention of a second party and possible distortion of intent, of interviewee. The technique is widely used for its emphasis on timeliness.

2. Surveying

Klein, Ballatine and Satten (1980); Ruminer and Burt (1980); and Whitlock, Graves and De Carlo (1980) all three groups utilized the surveying technique to single issue advantage - have the versatility of addressing diverse target populations simultaneously. The surveying assessment technique is a "descriptive" instrument, the questionnaire can be in the form of a "checklist" or "short answer questions" to be utilized by the respondent. The technique can be (and most often is) "handed out" (a direct method) or "circulated by mail" (an indirect method). Its major strength lies in its ease of answering, while its weakness may be in difficult complex instructions and overtaxing length. The technique is widely favored for its standardization and relatively inexpensiveness. This technique is by far the most used technique of those reported or recommended.

Self or Group Report Techniques

1. Delpi

Hentges and Hosokawa (1980) used the Delpi technique to multi-faceted developmental task advantage - permitting the continual free flow of data (stimuli-response interaction). The Delpi assessment technique is a "descriptive" instrument, the questionnaire series usually consists of "consensus feedback data" coupled with a new set of "narrative answer questions" to be utilized by respondent. The technique is most often "circulated by mail" (direct method), but can be utilized by "handout," such as in a "Think Tank" situation (i.e. Rand Corporation). Its strength lies in its anonymity ability to focus and continual and rapid feedback from previous response. Its

weakness would be found among those respondents who are less articulated with the written word and less motivated by the process itself. This technique is favored for diverse input and ability to facilitate group consensus.

2. Testing

Borg and Gail (1979), Gray (1976), Mehrens and Lehmann (1975) and Thorndike and Hogen (1977) all support the appropriateness of testing as a viable assessment technique, particularly in used in a well designed research project, but find testing very limited as might be adapted to a small needs assessment project. This technique utilizes either a verbal or written test procedures and instructions and some sort of answer or scoring medium. Testing instruments cover a wide range of educational and psychological evaluations (i.e. intelligence, aptitude, achievement, vocational and personality), in our particular situation the vocational or interest inventories might be most appropriate for needs assessment. This technique requires a trained administrator, standardized conditions and instructions. It can be administered to individuals or groups, "administered in person" (direct method) or in some cases "self-administered" (indirect). This technique's chief strength is its standardization and predictive quality - weakness in its limited scope of application and validity. Seldom used for this purpose due to inflexibility of contents and costs.

Group Report Techniques

1. Cybernetics

The cybernetics assessment technique is by far the newest and perhaps the most popular among humanistic psychologists. It is a free

flowing experiment in multi-group dynamics, whose energies are self-directed. The cybernetics technique requires a facilitator to present orientation, several general content questions for input, multi-group (subgroup) organization and line lapse control. Emphasis placed on a combined brainstorming and multi-subgroup discussions on round-robin. Its major strength lies in its free flow, unstructured content and continual response and feedback. Its weakness lies within the mood of group, time limits and cost/benefit ratios. This technique is favored because of social interaction and task completion.

2. Resolutions

Evans and Howard (1980) used the resolution (advisory committee) technique to a multi-faceted group task advantage (e.g. more like a hybrid of the Delpi, interviewing and surveying techniques combined - emphasizing their advantages). It utilizes a representation (or select) committee, to arbitrate organizational problems, identify aggregate needs, arriving at a group consensus on a resolution of required activities. Its chief strength is its institutional and managerial support and administrative sanction; its weakness pertains to limited participation and the trade-offs of group consensus versus individual needs. It has been favored by institutions for past years due to the need for uniformity and specific policy implementation and unit goal achievement. Evans et al (1980) have used this technique very effectively in assessing organization capacity as a resource in need studies.

Instrumentation

As we shall see, instrumentation is the master key of the Needs

Assessment, that it relates directly to a chosen technique and will make or break the implemental strategy. At this point, we inherit a paradox of sorts - it is a fact the painstaking care should be taken in developing or selecting the necessary instrumentation on one hand, but it is also a fact that very little is known about them in terms of research (e.g. constructs, content, criterion basis, etc.)

By the fact the questionnaire surveys and interviewing tools are at the nucleus of Survey Research, which is used primarily by education, a little more in-depth research has taken place on these types of instruments. Borg and Gall (1979) have attempted to at least address the questions of instrumentation development and design in their chapter on "The Methods and Tools of Survey Research." Their chapter explored both questionnaire and interview techniques and instruments. Borg's (1979) discussion of the questionnaire included defining the questionnaire objectives, selecting the sample, constructing questionnaire items, the questionnaire's format, pretesting of the questionnaire, the use of transmittal letters and follow-up, and what to do about non-respondents. His consideration of the interview included the use of interview guides, training of interviewers, recording the interview, effective communication techniques, the pretest of interview procedures, and common development errors.

It was interesting to note that Veres (1980) used a combined approach in her needs assessment, utilizing the advantages of the interview and questionnaire, while at the same time minimizing their weaknesses. Her instrumentation provided for a multiple choice format - machine-scorable form questionnaire, while at the same time using the

interview to summarize with comments and explanations on a supplemental sheet. This particular questionnaire's content covered the topics of background information, past participation, expressed learning interests, obstacles to participation, preferred conditions for participation, and the potential use of counseling and advising services (Veres, 1980).

In summary, we have moved through the entire process in rather a capsulated form, from idea conception (i.e. the needs assessment model), procedural tasks (i.e. the management strategy), to ways and means of acquisitioning data (i.e. the specific or combined techniques), to data collection of needs (i.e. the specific instrument), to finally implementation of the idea (i.e. the decision, analysis and dissemination). As previously noted throughout, there is still a great deal to be learned about this entire process and further keynoted by Pennington (1980). She states a worthy assessment should draw from multiple sources of data and that a fairly comprehensive framework should be used to identify as many key components as possible. In terms of participants (adult learners), it should be noted that their needs are not absolute, that their concept of need relates heavily to context, that individual needs will change in number and magnitude as their environment changes, and understanding that need in context requires both objective and subjective data (Pennington, 1980).

The remainder of this study will attempt to actualize these aforementioned models, strategies, techniques, and data to arrive at a reasonable program of professional development within the Division of Student Affairs.

Here at last, the theoretical investigation of needs assessment

leads us to the door of practical implementation of a needs assessment project.

Planning and Developing the Needs Assessment

This portion of the study will serve as a chronological record of those activities which have already transpired in the conceptualization and development of a professional growth program for the Division of Student Affairs (DSA), University of Southern Mississippi. It will be my purpose and intent to relate those activities to their preceeding conceptual parts.

The idea of a Professional Development program for the DSA was seeded by a proposal submitted to Dr. Probst, Dean of Student Services, during the Spring 1980-81 term (for details see Appendix "A").

DSA Model

With the advent of the Probst proposal, the Needs Assessment model (or perhaps more conclusively a decision-making process) had been established as imulated by Moore's (1980) study. The proposal implemented the model through identification of the problem. Problem recognition gave way quickly to the need to develop a plan (second point of Moore's model) of action.

DSA Strategy

This recognition brought forth the necessary sanction from the chief student personnel officer, Dr. Durkee. With this green light, the Probst Proposal brought about the convening of a representative but select committee to consider the issues of professional development within the the DSA on June 9, 1981. The committee's call to order - de facto established it as the PD implementation mechanism (Moore's third point).

From this point on the NA model becomes integrated into the committee's operational or management plan (concluding the first six steps of Barbulesco's plan/first two steps of Rimmer's abbreviated plan).

This framing and coordinating committee set the initial strategy to be followed. The committee decided a needs assessment was vital to the interests of the DSA, that their continued participation was crusal to the program's outcome, that a set of objectives and goals proposed by Dr. Probst was essential to its direction, that the scope should target all employees of the DSA regardless of physical location, that the only potential restraints might be time and funding, and finally, the participants would return to their respective offices to talk up the committee's activities on an informal basis (for details see Appendix "B").

At this June 9th meeting, a subcommittee was appointed to consider the following: identifying symptoms of broad need areas; to identify and select appropriate needs assessment techniques; to set criteria for measuring need; and lastly, getting the needs data (this concludes operational tasks 7-10 of Barbulesco's plan/steps 3-5 of Rimmer's plan). (For details see Appendix "C").

I entered the formulization process as a Needs Assessment consultant to the committee, and later the subcommittee with recommendations for utilizing the survey research methodology for greates efficiency of time and effectiveness of economy.

DSA Technique

The subcommittee asked that study and reported back on the development and implementation of the "survey technique" and its

"questionnaire components" by September 11th.

My first task was to discover or identify experienced resources (as noted by Ganzberger, 1980 and point four of Moore's model, 1980), which was fairly easy, due to prior exposure and research. During this interim period I corresponded with similar committees at Cornell University (CU), University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL), Eastern Michigan University (EMU) and North Carolina State University-Raleigh (NCSU) for their materials. Upon reviewing the materials received, I identified two source questionnaires, one from CU and the other from UNL, which I thought might be helpful in the development process (see Notes 1, 2, and 3).

DSA Instrumentation

My second task was to develop a set of objectives to define the questionnaire's purpose (phase one of Borg's 1979, development process):

1. To determine the percentage of offices responding?
2. To determine the percentage of responsibility level of those responding?
3. To determine the percentage by position seniority of those responding?
4. To determine the percentage by division seniority of those responding?
5. To determine the percentage of time of day preferences?
6. To determine the percentage of locational preferences?
7. To determine the percentage of presentation preferences?
8. To determine the percentage of duration preferences?
9. To determine the percentage of specific topic preferences

(needs)?

10. To determine the percentage having academic degrees?

11. To determine the percentage who either plan or are currently engaged in pursuing an academic degree?

12. To determine the percentage who have a personal career plan?

My third task of selecting the sample had already been accomplished by the PD Committee - as being "all DSA employees regardless of physical location" (Borg's phase two).

Task four dealt with the construction of questionnaire items which was to encompass the broad areas of need (i.e. organizational, judicial, communication, personal, professional and managerial) and the specific criteria for measuring need as already specified through the questionnaire's objective (i.e. prioritizing percentage of need in relationship one to the other). To accomplish this I drew heavily from my previous PD research (Hall, 1981), the CU and UNL samples, and a round-robin of administrator interviews which was designed to elicit their views and comments on a DSA needs assessment project and those particular issues or needs they felt important. Each administrator had his unique contribution, for Dr. Probst it was "experiencial opportunities"; for Ms. Grantham, it was necessity for "self studies, new employee orientation and awareness of serviced publics"; and for Mr. Paul, it was a growing emphasis on "competency based learning and leadership skills" (see Notes 1-6). (This concluded phase three Borg's development).

My fifth developmental task pertained to the questionnaire's format. After considering the above considerations and reviewing Borg and Gall (1979) and Gray (1976) I decided it should have three parts -

representing past, present and future situations. Upon further development, part one became known as "demographic data," part two (A) "preferences and topics" and part two (B) as "career directions." All three interrelated and giving voice to a full range of needs and reinforcement to the concept of "lifelong learning" (Borg's phase five).

DSA Pilot Survey

Developmental tasks six through eight required pretesting of the proposed questionnaire for content as related to its objectives, easy of reading, language of instructions, to substantiate "face validity" of instrument, and its sufficiency to canvas the scope of and to note unique needs. The pretest or pilot study (as it is most often referred to in the literature) was conducted on October 13th.

The pilot test was designed to cover four dispersed areas of student affairs of differential positions composed of a randomly selected sample of five participants who were distributed a copy of the sample survey questionnaire under a letter of transmittal containing a request for supervisor sanction and completion instructions. Of those surveys sent out, 100% were returned - 80% containing suggestions, notes and comments and further broken down as follows (phase six-eight, Borg, 1980). (For details see Appendix "E").

1. Offices Surveyed (4)

Housing	- 1
Counseling	- 1
Dean of Students	- 1
Financial Aid	- 1

2. Positions Surveyed (5)

Business Manager	- 1
Associate Dean	- 1
Counselor	- 1
Financial Aid Counselor	- 1
Secretary	- 1

3. Response (100%)

Responses - 5
Nonresponse - 0

4. Utilization (100%)

Supported - 5
Nonsupported - 0

5. Suggestions and comments noted:

1. Should permit prioritizing of topics and/or needs.
2. Should include topic pertaining to "legal issues impacting or pertaining student personnel work."
3. Should include acknowledgement of work toward advanced academic degrees.
4. Should include final instructions as to the deposition of the completed survey and its related due date.

My final and ninth task required considering and evaluating the suggestions and comments of the random sample and their applicability to the questionnaire for its stated objectives. All suggestions and comments were found to be noteworthy, so the sample survey was modified to incorporate these necessary changes and several cosmetic modifications. At this point, we have arrived just about full circle, with the finished product, highly polished and ready to use for the needs assessment survey. It would be presented to the subcommittee for review and if approved for implementation.

All that remains left to do is to administer the survey to the DSA staff. Once concluded, the data would need to be summarized and analyzed, rank ordered and evaluated for the aggregated staff needs. The findings by the PD committee would then be reported to the Chief Student Personnel Officer for review and instructions, and hopefully for implementation of findings through an appropriate PD program. (This would conclude

Barbulesco's tasks 11-161 and Rimmer's steps 5 and 6). (For details see Appendix "F").

We are now at the point of developing and implementing the desired Professional Development program for the DSA staff, but we are not quite finished . . . yet!

Last, but certainly not least, would be the need to complete the developmental cycle, according to Rimmer and Burt (1980). This last step would consist of evaluating the above implemented PD program and at the same time to update and make current the wealth of needs data already on file. This final step would be to conduct a follow-up needs assessment, thereby completing the cycle and beginning anew.

From Needs to Curriculum

Now we have finally arrived at the "meat" fo the entire preceeding process - the development and programming of the DSA Professional Development Program.

Nearly all educators are concerned with program design and development (i.e. curriculums composed of numerous curricula), falling within a specific discipline or body of knowledge - containing precise subject matter. If my interpretation of educational concepts hold, then our curriculum would address "student personnel work," with various curricula pertaining to student financial aid administration, "student housing administration," and etc. Our body of knowledge would consist mostly of the student personnel and student development philosophies, while our precise subject matter lent itself to adapted philosophy, jurisprudence, language, economics and logic, to be further supplemented with professional, practical and utilitarian skills of a technical nature

at various competency levels.

Program Content

In order that I might pursue a preliminary (curriculum) for a professional development program, I would like to propose a DSA Professional Development model. This model is based on the assumption that the actual content would be generated from the prioritizing of both the DSA aggregated needs and of individual needs, identified through a DSA-wide Needs Assessment project, while at the same time incorporating organization and senior consolidation requirements (needs).

The proposed model lends itself well to program composition, which would draw from its two major vertical divisions for structure, the lower speaks to group foundation needs, while the upper speaks to individual professional needs. The model's upper division is further divided into ten horizonal component areas (each area relating to a specific operational entity/target population). The lower left corner of the model addresses the needs of new employees, while the upper right corner of the model addresses the needs of professional interested student workers who might have a strong interest in entering the field of student personnel work.

The model is laid out in such a way as to represent a matrix of activities (Appleton, Briggs and Rhatigan, 1978; Hall, 1981; Herron, 1970; Miller, 1975; and Shaffer and Martinson, 1966) from top to bottom, moving from fundamental skills left to highly specialized and specific skills and competencies to the right (those areas which are blank, require highly differentiated activities to be designated at a later time).

Master Program

The art of program development would be a complex matter of mixing selected components based on prioritized needs - lower division for "groups," upper division for "individuals." Please note on Figure 1 those activities preceeded by a dot (·) were excluded from the developed survey questionnaire, all others included.

For the proposed DSA program, I would draw upon the following program tools (previously described):

1. DSA-Professional Development model (figure 1.)
2. Associated matrix of PD activities
3. A previously constructed component matrix (figure 2.) (representing current PD activities in similar programs)

Using the above tools, my simulated needs assessment data, and assuming there would be at least one activity each month (over an annual program calendar), I would probably produce the schedule entitled "Preliminary Professional Development Program, Division of Student Affairs" (figure 3.).

As you will note, the schedule covers a calendar year, has content variety and depth, is multi-purposed, utilizes numerous delivery systems and an assortment of campus locations. The delivery system and campus location have been keyed to the specific content and target population (only a representative sample of delivery systems and locations were utilized for this demonstration).

Conclusions

As this paper has attempted to demonstrate, there is a continuing and growing awareness for the need to plan, develop and implement

institutional Needs Assessment activities. This need is prevalent in all areas of higher education, but particularly within those areas which must cater to professional development needs and wants, in terms of professional education, continuing education or lifelong learning.

Further, as we have already witnessed a great deal of effort has gone into the development of its related methodology and associated technology. This area of endeavor has grown so quickly, that it has outstripped the capacity of educational research to keep pace. This widening gap is leaving these activities open to a number of criticisms as to the effectiveness of its methodology (strategies), the validity and reliability of its developing technology (techniques) employed, and the vary efficiency of its theoretical base.

Implementation of these plans and guidelines and use of these assorted tools are easy enough in the layman's hands, requiring no special equipment, only a modest investment of time and money are necessary. Any organization willing to make the investment will be amply rewarded many times over through ingenuity, innovation, efficient and effective operations, and highly motivated employees who would be seen as content, competent, growing and professionally achieving.

The final phase of this study related to another entire area of endeavor, which must utilize the wealth of data generated by the Needs Assessment activity to bring the process and results to full bloom, the program of action! Again, to bring use closer to needs fulfillment we must begin anew to investigate models, strategies, techniques and vehicles, which will permit us to build a bridge to lifelong learning and needs fulfillment.

I believe Floyd C. Pennington (1980) can best sum it up as follows:

> It should also be pointed out that needs of a system are not the sum of the needs of the individuals within it (McMahon, 1970). Although systems have problems, they cannot be educated. What a system is said to need is basically what an observer needs or wants for the given system. If the performance of a system is to improve, the individuals within the system must act upon themselves and upon their system.

Figure 1. DSA - PD Model / PD Activities Matrix
(Subject Matter by Area)

FOUNDATIONS	PERSONAL	BASIC		
		Understanding, Control		
				• PUBLICITY PUBLIC ADDRESS TELEPHONE MANNERISMS COMPOSITION COMMUNICATION PROCESS
				MEMO-RX PERSONAL FIN MGT TIME MANAGEMENT ASSERTIVENESS SELF MOTIVATION CAREER ADVISING WORKING THROUGH SYSTEM CONFLICT RESOLUTION COPING STRESS PERSUASION REFERRAL LEADERSHIP
				Policy FORMULATION ETHICAL ISSUES + STANDARDS STUDENT LIFESTYLES - CHANG CULTURAL DIFF - SP. GROUPS PROCEDURAL RELATIONSHIPS
				• PROF. Institutes (Philosophy) • PROF. CONFERENCE (Social) • PROF. WORKSHOPS (Skill)
				• Prof. READINGS GRANT WRITING - RESEARCH - AUTHORSHIP LOOP EXCHANGES - CONSULTING - ACADEMIC PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT (Improvement) PROF. COMPETENCY - SELF STUDY (CERTIFICATION)
				COMPUTERS • CASE STUDIES BUDGETING + FINANCE MBO PLANNING + DECISION M. ORGAN. + STAFFING OPERATING PROCEDURES
	PROFESSIONAL	INTERMEDIATE		
		ADVANCED		
	CONSOLIDATION			
	SPECIALIZATION			
ORGANIZATIONAL	JUDICIAL	PHILOSOPHICAL		

"PERSONAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS"

"INTRA - PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP SKILLS"

" COMMUNICATION SKILLS "

• SECTION 504
• EDUCATIONAL AMEND
PRIVACY ACT
• CIVIL RIGHTS
• EO GUIDELINES

"STATE & FEDERAL LAWS PERTAINING TO EDUCATION"

• NEW EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION •

STUDENT AFFAIRS
• SERVICES
PURCHASING
PROMOTION
EVALUATION
PERSONNEL

"INSTITUTIONAL & SYSTEM Policy CONSIDERATIONS"

• NEW EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION •

SUPPORT
• INSTRUCTION
STUDENT PERSONNEL
UNIVERSITY

"INSTITUTIONAL & UNIT MISSION & GOALS"

• NEW EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION •

Figure 2. Component Matrix

	Professional Development Activities	NCSU	EMU	CSU
1.	Cookout to welcome new members (social)	X		
2.	Student Affairs Old-fashioned Picnic (social)	X		
3.	Career/life planning for the professional (Special topic)	X		
4.	Job interviewing - techniques and rights (Special topic)	X		
5.	Race relations (skill development)	X		
6.	College student characteristics (Sp. topic)	X	X	
7.	Employee morale (Special topic)	X		
8.	International students (Special topic)	X	(X)	
9.	Impact of continuing education students (Special topic)	X		
10.	Burrow's management workshops (Skill development)	X	X	X
11.	The handicapped experience (Skill development)	X		
12.	HEW and UNC System (Special topic)	X		
13.	Student Affairs Annual Staff Meeting	X	X	X
14.	Equal opportunity rights (Class)	X*	X	
15.	Developing effective listening		X	
16.	Legal right. of students	X*	X	
17.	Ethics		X	
18.	Basic human relations		X	X
19.	Resident hall staffing		X	
20.	Transcendental Meditation (TM)		X	
21.	Computer - DP	X*		X
22.	Personnel policies	X*		X
23.	Language			X
24.	Writing	X*		X
25.	Experimental learning			X
26.	Stress management			X
27.	Clerical			X
28.	University customs			X
29.	Time management	X*		X
30.	Statistics	X*		X

Note: Denotes offered but cancelled ( )
Denotes special group learning *

Figure 3.
Preliminary Professional Development Program
Division of Student Affairs

	CONTENT:	PURPOSE:	METHOD:	LOCATION:
Sept	University Mission & Goals	Philosophical	Lecture	Auditorium
Oct	Communications Process	Understanding	Skills Workshop	Lab
Nov	Procedural Relationships	Basic Competency	Panel Discussion	Class Room
Dec	Self-Study	Advanced Competency	Independent Study	Conference Room
Jan	Personnel Policies	Philosophical & Judicial	Guest Speaker & Lecture	Auditorium
Feb	Leadership Basics	Personal Development	Skills Workshop	Lab
Mar	Cultural Differents	Basic Competency	Panel Discussion	Class Room
Apr	Program Development	Advanced Competency	Contract Learning	Office
May	EO Guidelines	Judicial	Lecture	Auditorium
Jun	Career Advising	Personal Development	Small Group	Class Room
Jul	(Professional Workshops)	Intermediate Competency	Independent Study	Off Campus
Aug	Operating Procedures	Management Competency	Small Group	Class Room

APPENDIX

Needs Assessment

Instrumentation

REVISION 2# (Final)

#_____

29

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
October 28, 1981

TO: Staff
Division of Student Affairs

FROM: Charles W. Hall
Graduate Researcher

SUBJECT: Divisional Staff Development Survey F81-82

Part One of this survey consists of demographic data only. This part will be detached and stored separately to maintain anonymity of response. Please complete the following items by checking the appropriate item (only one) for each section.

PART ONE

Section I. Work Area:

1. ___Vice President's Office
2. ___Dean of Student's Office
3. ___Dean of Student Services Offices
4. ___Health Services
5. ___Counseling
6. ___Financial Aid
7. ___Housing
8. ___Student Activities & Union
9. ___Placement
10. ___Veterans Affairs
11. ___Security
12. ___Other

Section II. Level of Responsibility:

1. ___Administrator (Vice President/Dean/Associate Dean/Director)
2. ___Professional (Assistant Director/Counselor/Coordinator)
3. ___Section Supervisor
4. ___Clerical (Secretary/Clerk/Machine Operator)
5. ___Student Worker
6. ___Other

Section III. Current Job Experience:

1. ___0-1 year
2. ___1-5 years
3. ___5-10 years
4. ___10 years or more

Section IV. Experience within Division:

1. ___0-1 year
2. ___1-5 years
3. ___5-10 years
4. ___10 years or more

REVISION 2# (Final) #_____

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
October 28, 1981

TO: Staff
Division of Student Affairs

FROM: Charles W. Hall
Graduate Researcher

SUBJECT: Divisional Staff Development Survey F81-82

Please complete the following items to reflect your personal and individual wants and needs, as they pertain to improvement and developmental training which may be conducted, should this survey warrant. Please check each item for which you are in favor. NOTE: Should you use multiple responses for any sub-section, please number responses in order of preference (e.g., 1, highest or first choice, followed by 2, etc.).

PART TWO

Section I. Preferences: (check all that apply)

1. Time of day preference for participation

___a. Morning
___b. Extended Lunch Hour (brown bagging lunch)
___c. Afternoon
___d. Evening
___e. Other:_____

2. Preference for place of training

___a. Office
___b. Dining Room
___c. Class Room
___d. Other:_____

3. Preference for a special type of presentation

___a. Discussion
___b. Film and Discussion
___c. Formal presentation and guest speaker
___d. Formal presentation by staff or faculty
___e. Workshop practice
___f. Social gathering
___g. Other:_____

4. Preference for length of training

___a. 30 minutes
___b. 45 minutes
___c. 60 minutes
___d. Other:_____

5. Checklist of potential topics

a. Developing Skills:

___1. Time management at the office
___2. Communication skills
___3. Memory skills
___4. Assertiveness
___5. Personal time management
___6. Conflict resolution
___7. Working through the System
___8. Coping with stress
___9. Composing letters and memos
___10. Career advising
___11. Personal financial planning
___12. The Art of referral
___13. Persuasion skills for use in the job
___14. Increased typing proficiency
___15. Job management
___16. The Art of telephone communication
___17. Leadership skills
___18. Self-motivation
___19. Management by objective

b. Acquiring Information:

___1. University budgeting and finance
___2. Future of USM's student personnel degree program
___3. New office machines
___4. University purchasing policies & procedures
___5. University personnel policies & procedures
___6. Promotion/Job advancement guidelines & preparation
___7. Performance evaluation criteria
___8. Introduction to computers
___9. History of the Student Affairs function
___10. Trends & Issues of the Southern College Personnel Association and NASPA
___11. Professional development & professional associations
___12. Role & Function of University Computer Center
___13. Role & Function of the Division of Student Affairs
___14. Role & Function of USM

c. Increasing Awareness:

___1. Diversity of student lifestyles
___2. Ethical issues in student personnel work
___3. Impact of the Privacy Act
___4. Cultural/Ethnic differences and how to respond to them
___5. Legal issues having impact upon Student Personnel work
___6. Security of process and product
___7. Registration process and procedures
___8. Admissions process and procedures
___9. Student Data Management process and procedures
___10. Special Academic programs and services

#_____

___11. Greek System process and procedures
___12. Financial Aid process and procedures
___13. Housing process and procedures
___14. Placement process and procedures
___15. Union process and procedures
___16. Health Care process and procedures
___17. Counseling Center process and procedures
___18. V.A. process and procedures
___19. Security process and procedures

Section II. Career Directions: (check one for each item)

1. Do you have an academic degree?

_____Yes _____No

2. Are you now or do you plan to pursue an academic degree or advanced academic degree?

_____Yes _____No

3. Do you have a personal career plan at present?

_____Yes _____No

Section III. Other:

1. Please list briefly any personal wants or needs that you have and would like to have addressed by this survey:

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Any additional comments or suggestions pertaining to this suvey or professional/staff/personal development would be appreciated:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Date Completed:_____

PLEASE NOTE: Return completed forms to Charles W. Hall, Registrar's Office, Room 110E not later than_____. Your time, interest, and assistance is appreciated. Thanks.

Reference Notes

1. Butler, R.C. Professional growth committee. Raleigh, NC; North Carolina State University at Raleigh, 1978. (Inter-departmental memoranda)

2. Brown, S. Position paper: staff development program. Lincoln, NB; University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1973. (Inter-departmental memoranda)

3. Gratham, W.R. Personal interview notes of March 10, 1981. Hattiesburg, MS; University of Southern Mississippi.

4. Paul, J.S. Personal interview notes of March 9, 1981. Hattiesburg, MS; University of Southern Mississippi.

5. Probst, C.H. Personal interview notes of March 6, 1981. Hattiesburg, MS; University of Southern Mississippi.

6. Thomas, G.S. Encouraging employee growth: a guide to staff relations and training. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, undated. (Policy memoranda)

References

Appleton, J.R., Briggs, C.M., & Rhatigan, J.J. Pieces of eight. Portland, OR: NASPA Institute of Research and Development, 1978.

Barbulesco, C.W. Components of a major needs assessment study. New Directions for Continuing Education, 1980, 7, 73-82. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 233-638)

Bock, L.K. Needs assessment in planning graduate degree programs. New Directions for Continuing Education, 1980, 7, 37-42. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 233-632)

Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D. Educational Research: an introduction, 3rd Ed. New York, NY: Longman, Inc., 1979.

Evans, A.H. Jr., & Howard, C. An assessment capability: community colleges can compete for or be involved in needs studies. Community and Junior College Journal, 1980-81, 51 (4), 18-20.

Gay, L.R. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1976.

Goldman, L. ed. Research Methods for Counselors. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1978.

Grary, L.R. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1976.

Gunzberger, L.K. Assessing the need for a university program. New Directions for Continuing Education, 1980, 7, 59-63. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 233-636)

Hall, [illegible].W. Professional Development within the Division of Student Affairs, University of Southern Mississippi, 1981 (Unpublished)

Hentges, K., & Hosokawa, M.C. Delphi: group participation in needs assessment and curriculum development. The Journal of School Health, 1980, 50 (8), 447-450.

Herron, O.R. Jr. New Dimensions in Student Personnel Administration. Scranton, PA: International Textbooks, 1970.

Klein, H.A., Ballantine, J.H., Sattew, L.L. Organizational sensitivity: for a campus child care facility. A Journal for School Administrators, 1980, 11 (2), 88-96.

Mehrens, W.A. & Lehmann, I.J. Standardized Tests in Education, 2d Ed. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Moore, D.E. Jr. Assessing the needs of adults for continuing education: a model. New Directions for Continuing Education, 1980, 7, 91-98. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. EJ 233-640)

Pennington, F.C. Educational needs assessment: conclusion. New Directions for Continuing Education, 1980, 7, 99-103. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 233-635)

Rimmer, S.M., & Burt, M.A. Needs assessment: a step-by-step approach. The School Counselor, 1980, 28 (1), 59-62.

Shaffer, R.H., & Martinson, W.D. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York, NY: the Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.

Thorndike, R.L., & Hagen, E.P. Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education, 4th Ed. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.

Veres, H.C. From assessment to implementation. New Directions for Continuing Education, 1980, 7, 15-24. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 233-630)

Whitlock, M., Groves, D.L., DeCarlo, W.B. A needs assessment in employee services-industrial recreation. Journal of Employment Counseling, 1980, 17, (3), 173-179.